

---

**From:** Schruth, Susan (FTA)  
**To:** Biehl, Scott (FTA); James, Aaron (FTA); Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA)  
**CC:** Libberton, Sean (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Blakesley, Jayme (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)  
**Sent:** 11/25/2009 12:15:39 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu and PMOC

I do not believe Jim's summary or previous descriptions by the region propose a role for the PMOC that is appropriate. We need the local sponsor to develop their project (which includes work on alternatives and making judgments about what they are willing to support). We ensure that they have developed management tools, organizational strategies, construction plans, schedules and budgets that ensure successful execution of the project and then we monitor their execution.

I do not support the PMOC weighing in or evaluating or helping to evaluate alternative alignments.

Susan

Susan E. Schruth  
Associate Administrator  
Office of Program Management  
Federal Transit Administration  
202-366-1611  
c 202-841-5073

---

**From:** Biehl, Scott (FTA)  
**Sent:** Monday, November 23, 2009 11:13 AM  
**To:** James, Aaron (FTA); Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA)  
**Cc:** Schruth, Susan (FTA); Libberton, Sean (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Blakesley, Jayme (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)  
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu and PMOC

At the end of the day, from my vantage, this is a policy call for Schruth. It's all about making wise decisions on the use of our precious PMOC resources. In this instance, I wouldn't recommend the same very aggressive use of PMOC resources that we made for Dulles. To be blunt, this project doesn't have the political muscle that Dulles had. (At least not until we hear directly from the President who grew up in Honolulu.) Rather than risk depletion of PMOC resources on ambiguous proposals, I'd compel the grantee to develop a definitive alternative for addressing all the airport issues that we can be confident will pass muster with FAA management—and only then would I task the PMOC to scrub that alternative in earnest.

As a matter of law, though, I can find a way to support whatever use of the PMOC resources Schruth would like to make.

sab

---

**From:** James, Aaron (FTA)  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 21, 2009 2:15 PM  
**To:** Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA)  
**Cc:** Schruth, Susan (FTA); Libberton, Sean (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA); Biehl, Scott (FTA)  
**Subject:** Re: Honolulu and PMOC

Chris is correct regarding the use of PMOCs based on 49 CFR Part 633. PMOC are usually assigned upon entry into PE but it is assumed that at entry to PE the alignment is known. For Dulles, during my tenure at FTA, we did not use the PMOC to study alternatives but instead to do a budget verification on the proposed alignment without major tunnelling. We should let Susan S and Scott Biehl weigh in on the use of PMOCs for this purpose. .

Aaron

**From:** Nutakor, Chris (FTA)  
**To:** Borinsky, Susan (FTA)  
**Cc:** Schruth, Susan (FTA); Libberton, Sean (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA); James, Aaron (FTA)  
**Sent:** Fri Nov 20 22:44:42 2009  
**Subject:** RE: Honolulu and PMOC

Susan,  
The meeting effectively ended when you left. There was no further discussion on the role of the PMOC other than what we discussed when you were there and that was that Honolulu would have to decide on an alignment and only then can the PMOC be tasked to review it. The PMOC would not be involved in working on many alternatives to enable Honolulu reach a decision as to which one to adopt. I know someone said that they had the PMOC do that for Dulles. My bosses can weigh in. Thanks.

Chris

---

**From:** Borinsky, Susan (FTA)  
**Sent:** Fri 11/20/2009 5:33 PM  
**To:** Schruth, Susan (FTA); Libberton, Sean (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Nutakor, Chris (FTA); Nguyen, Kim (FTA)  
**Subject:** Honolulu and PMOC

Susan, Sean, Aaron, Chris and Kim:

Here's Jim Ryan's summary of the Regional-HQ Honolulu call earlier today. Please note his statement on PMOC involvement highlighted below, which seems inconsistent with what I take to be TPM's position. I had to leave the meeting early and maybe Chris can confirm the discussion and conclusion on the role of a PMOC. Please let me know what you think. I'm trying to get this to Peter this evening, so how about my just saying:

The level of effort and timeframe will depend on the complexity of the avoidance alternative and the extent to which the City has already considered alignment options in the vicinity. FTA would commit to efficient coordination by assigning the PMOC to review the avoidance alternative proposed by the City.

## HONOLULU

TRO-09, TPM, and TPE met by conference call today (November 20) to clarify the status of the runway issue at the Honolulu airport and to consider alternatives for proceeding.

The issue arises because a change by FAA in the runway protection zone (RPZ) requirement was missed by the City and its engineers as they finalized the alignment through the airport. Consequently, the current alignment of the rail project fails to meet the revised requirement. FTA's PMOC identified this problem in June 2009 and the City has been reluctant to deal with its implications in hopes of meeting their aggressive schedule.

This issue has become the principal barrier to completion and publication of the FEIS. The City has obtained sign-offs from FAA and Hawaii DOT on letters from the City to FTA outlining what the City hopes is a way forward. The letters acknowledge the problem, identify adjustments to the runways as the likely solution, and promise a study of to determine the details of runway adjustments. The promised study is insufficient for FTA purposes in finalizing the FEIS, however, because it can bring closure to the issue only at some undetermined point in the future. The FEIS must present a specific rail alignment, identify its impact on the RPZ, and commit to specific mitigations of those impacts (including secondary impacts of the runway adjustments), and document the costs of all mitigations. A study of these mitigations will require an effort that involves an ongoing update of the airport master plan and an uncertain timeframe that may extend well into 2010.

Today's conference call concluded with agreement to pursue two approaches to a resolution of the airport issue sufficient to enable finalization and publication of the FEIS.

First, FTA will prepare a letter to the City conveying (1) FTA's conclusion that the FAA and HDOT sign-offs on letters outlining future analysis of the issue are an insufficient basis for finalizing the FEIS, and (2) an outline for an alternative approach that will bring closure in a reasonable timeframe: the development of an avoidance alternative that complies with the new RPZ requirement and thereby avoids any need to pursue runway adjustments, mitigations of consequent on-airport impacts, and coordination with HDOT's update of the airport master plan. Development of an avoidance alternative will require some effort by the City to determine an alignment and station location, prepare engineering materials, identify impacts and their mitigations, and estimate costs. The level of effort and timeframe will depend on the complexity of the avoidance alternative and the extent to which the City has already considered alignment options in the vicinity. FTA would commit to efficient coordination by assigning

the PMOC to review options and their analysis as the City's work proceeds on the avoidance alternative.

Second, with your approval, FTA will initiate contact with FAA headquarters to explore options for proceeding. FAA's regulations provide for a waiver of RPZ requirements. FTA will inquire on the possibilities of a waiver given the other structures (buildings and an elevated freeway) proximate to the proposed rail alignment and station location.